

06
sending an e-mail to an e-mail address provided by the guest.

8. (New) The method of claim 6 wherein sending a receipt electronically comprises:
sending a facsimile transmission to a facsimile phone number provided by the guest.
-

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 10, 2003, in which claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland et al. (U.S. patent No. 4,553,222), and claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland et al. in view of Pepe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,905).

Independent claim 1 discloses a method for automated checkout from a lodging facility. Included in the method are the elements of displaying for review on a guest terminal a list of charges the guest's account, performing a checkout based upon the charges listed in response to a selection made by the guest, and sending of a receipt electronically to a destination provided by the guest.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being unpatentable in view of Kurland et al. Kurland teaches the delivery of a bill by printing or displaying the check. See Fig. 4. The printing of the check is to a printer (34) attached to the central computer (22). See Fig. 1. Kurland does not disclose a destination provided by the guest for the printing of the guest check.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03, citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). All works in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970). Thus, all the features of claim 1 must be taught or suggested by the Kurland et al. in order to properly reject the claim. The Kurland et al. reference does not teach a destination provided by the guest, but instead a destination preset in the system. Therefore, since the Kurland et al. reference does not disclose all the of the recited elements of claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

**APPENDIX:
MARKED UP VERSION OF SPECIFICATION AND CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

Claims 2-5 all depend from claim 1. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For purposes of the dependancy on claim 1, claims 2-5 are allowable with the parent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

With this Amendment, all of pending claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The examiner may contact the undersigned at the location and telephone number listed below if such would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 6/27/03

By 

David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580